DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 320 HE 027 358

AUTHOR Rafferty, Cathleen D.
TITLE Promoting Multi-Site Collaborative Inquiry: Initial Efforts and Challenges.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 94
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; Adult Development; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Dynamics; Higher Education; Inquiry; *Partnerships in Education; *Program Implementation; Theory Practice Relationship; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana State University

ABSTRACT

This paper explores perspectives, issues, and experiences related to initiating collaborative inquiry across multiple levels and sites, based on school-university partnerships developed between Indiana State University (ISU) and 10 professional development schools (five elementary schools, one middle school, and four high schools). Principles guiding collaboration, basic assumptions, and themes are outlined. Challenges involved in collaborative inquiry may be due to cultural differences between schools and universities--for example, the university culture produces scholarly knowledge while school faculty are expected to use rather than produce knowledge. A paradigm shift is therefore necessary, to establish new norms for collegial, collaborative, inquiry-based relationships. Such a paradigm shift requires attention to group dynamics, action research processes, and adult development theories. Collaborative inquiry goals and a three-phase plan developed by the Collaborative Inquiry Team at ISU are presented. The paper concludes that collaborative inquiry has much potential to support learning and restructuring at both schools and universities; that there are many complexities in equipping faculty with skills, abilities, and dispositions necessary to collaborate; and that collaborative inquiry should be depicted as a journey rather than a destination. Appendices provide a description of collaborative inquiry, a call for proposals for inquiry projects, an instrument for screening inquiry proposals, and a sample proposal. (Contains 24 references.) (JDD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 369 320

# PROMOTING MULTI-SITE COLABORATIVE INQUIRY: INITIAL EFFORTS AND CHALLENGES

by

Cathleen D. Rafferty, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Curriculum, Instruction, and
Media Technology
School of Education 1023
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809
(812)237-2958
ESRAFFE@BEFAC.INDSTATE.EDU

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
April 4, 1994
New Orleans, LA

HE027357

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cathleen D. Rafferty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# PROMOTING MULTI-SITE COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY: INITIAL EFFORTS AND CHALLENGES

The advent of school-university partnerships has created rich opportunities for informing teaching and learning at all levels. In the case of Indiana State University, this has meant simultaneous nurturing of ten professional development schools (five elementary, one middle school, and four high schools). Initial efforts often pose unique challenges and opportunities as the cultures of schools and universities come together to create alternative learning environments for students and faculty. This paper will explore perspectives, issues, and experiences related to initiating collaborative inquiry across multiple levels and sites. Section one provides background information regarding the genesis and nature of ISU's collaboration with area schools. Definitions and perspectives about collaborative inquiry and related issues are provided in sections two and three. Section four chronicles our collaborative inquiry experience to Spring 1994 while section five charts future directions.

## Background

During Spring 1992, after the Board of Trustees voted to close the university school, Indiana State University extended an invitation to local schools to join in partnership as Professional Development Schools (PDS). PDS sites are often characterized by a number of tenets or principles (e.g. Holmes, 1990; Rafferty, 1993a) and those in partnership with Indiana State University are no exception. The following list describes the principles guiding collaboration between ISU and ten affiliated PDS sites:

1. A PDS uses effective curricular, instructional, and administrative practices to help ensure that all students reach their full potential and students and as persons.

2. A PDS provides for renewal, professional growth, and continuing education of all participants.

3. A PDS serves as a site for pre-service educators to work in a stimulating learning environments with outstanding practioners. In general, it allows prospective teachers and other educators-in-training to experience the full range of responsibilities of practioners in their professional fields.

4. A PDS supports inquiry, research, and exchange of professional knowledge.

In addition to these principles, our collaborative efforts are built on three basic assumptions and three themes (Henry, et al., 1994):

## Three Basic Assumptions
(Sirotnick and Goodlad, 1988)

1. Schools want to provide an exemplary learning environment for the children/youth they serve.

2. Universities (ISU School of Education) want to provide an exemplary learning environment for the professional educators they prepare.

3. We enhance the probability of fulfilling both goals if we join together and focus on creating an environment that enhances the learning of children and youth and those who teach them.

## Three Themes

THEME ONE: LEARNING

-Create a new institution - The Professional Development School
-Preservice, Induction, and In-Service for School/University Faculty

THEME TWO: RESTRUCTURING

-Altering the Rules, Roles, and Relationships Within our Organizations or Systemic Change through "Simultaneous Renewal"
-Indiana 2000 Program/Re:Learning

THEME THREE: COLLABORATION

-PDS Steering Committee: Governance, Planning, and Resource Allocation
-Inquiry: Building the Knowledge Base

Although all of these principles, assumptions, and themes are intertwined and mutually supporting, the focus of this paper is collaborative inquiry and related challenges. Clarification of basic terminology and exploration of challenges follows.

Definitions, Distinctions, and Challenges

I tend to interchange collaborative inquiry and collaborative action research. Both contain essential elements as described by Oja and Pine (1987): 1) research problems are mutually defined, 2) school and university faculty collaborate to seek solutions to school-based issues, 3) findings are jointly reported and are used to solve mutually defined problems, 4) school faculty develop research skills and university faculty (re)discover field-based methodologies, and 5) faculty from both cultures are professionally renewed (p. 97).

Given these characteristics, this type of inquiry can be subsumed within Freire's concept of praxis as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (1970). At a conceptual or theoretical level such collaborative activity seems rather straightforward. However, as anyone engaged in collaborative inquiry would attest, challenges are both inevitable and sometimes daunting. Why?

At the risk of oversimplification, it seems that cultural differences is a likely explanation, as recently analyzed by Green, et al. (1993). Although both schools and universities share a mission of teaching, the structures and expectations surrounding that mission are inherently different. Most school faculty teach numerous classes and

students under rigid and restrictive schedules. The converse is usually the case at the university. Roles and responsibilities also vary dramatically. University faculty teach and regularly communicate with colleagues on committees and other projects, but they are also expected to read, research, write, and produce scholarly knowledge. Meanwhile, school faculty teach, are usually isolated from collegial interchanges, and too often are expected to use rather than produce knowledge. An additional distinction is one of status. While university faculty are viewed as researchers or scholars in "higher" education, the nomenclature for school faculty is teacher or practioner.

These cultural distinctions impact both experiences and expectations. Rather than collaborating to answer education questions, the prevailing tradition or paradigm has been that one culture produces knowledge for the other resulting in an ever-widening gulf between research and practice. As noted by Watts (1985),

> Teachers complain that research findings are contradictory, impractical, faddish, and fickle. (while) Researchers sometimes say teachers are unresponsive, indifferent, unreflective, and so constrained by school structures or norms that they couldn't improve if they wanted to (p. 118).

These are serious allegations whether universally indicative or not. Nonetheless, before collaborative inquiry of the kind described by Oja and Pine (1987) and others becomes the common experience and expectation of all educators, a paradigm shift is necessary.

Defining and Shifting Paradigms

A paradigm can be defined as "a set of rules and regulations that: 1) defines boundaries; 2) tells you what to do within those boundaries" (Burkan, 1989). In other words, a paradigm is a lens through which you view or sort experiences and thereby set expectations. A longstanding and prevailing paradigm of educational research is one of research "on" teachers, students, and schools rather than research "with" them. Despite its emergence over 50 years ago (Watts, 1985), action research or collaborative inquiry remains the exception rather than the norm. The traditional research paradigm featuring quantitative, experimental design components administered by university-based researchers maintains a strong foothold, especially in America.

Fortunately, with the increase of school-university collaborative initiatives such as Professional Development Schools, action research has again received widespread attention. This resurgence seems related to shared governance or participatory leadership structures which involve teachers more directly in decision-making processes. Only relatively recently have experts and policy makers acknowledged that both schools and society are incredibly complex and mutually dependent entities. As a result, the insight and expertise that teachers can bring to the problem-identification and solution process has only begun to be recognized. This definitely marks a paradigm shift - at least for those who acknowledge teachers as experts and intellectuals in their own right. Unfortunately, the shift is far from complete or pervasive.

Nearly 30 years ago Robert Schaefer, Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University wrote that:

> we can no longer afford to conceive of the schools simply as distribution centers for dispensing cultural orientations, information, and knowledge developed by other social units. The complexities of teaching and learning in formal classrooms have become so formidable and the intellectual demands upon the system so enormous that the school must be more than a place of instruction. It must also be a center of inquiry - a producer as well as a transmitter of knowledge (Schaefer, 1967, pp. 1-2).

Sadly, too many schools are anything but centers of inquiry and we have far to go to equip both school and university faculty with requisite skills, abilities, and dispositions necessary to engage in collaborative inquiry. (For additional insights also see Rafferty, 1993b.)

It would seem that a most viable mechanism for simultaneous renewal is collaborative inquiry that empowers and enlightens school faculty, (re)confirms the complexities of field-based practice for university faculty, and provides powerful practices and exemplars for teacher education students working in rich contexts like professional development schools in which collaboration and inquiry are expectations. Even so, research and experience indicate that establishing new norms for collegial, collaborative, inquiry-based relationships is most challenging, as detailed in the next section.

## Building Capacity for Praxis - The ISU Experience

Earlier, Freire's notion of praxis was described as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (1970). In addition, Harste (1993) recently asserted that "research has moved from the status of a tool to a foundational science in education" primarily due to our "increased understanding of the role that

language plays in learning" (p. 357). As a result, more educators now view inquiry as a process that involves "voice, conversation, reflexivity, and actions" (p. 357). Our recent experience at Indiana State University will illuminate efforts and challenges related to promoting collaborative inquiry in multiple sites and levels.

Rather than focus on a single school, the task has been to coordinate collaborative inquiry in ten recently established professional development school sites (five elementary, one middle school, and four high schools). As expected, multiple-site initiatives magnify complexities. Although a group of school-university representatives with approval of the PDS Steering Committee did establish a definition or description of collaborative inquiry during 1992-93 (See Appendix A), articulation of intents and purposes culminating in actual projects in multiple sites proved more challenging than we had imagined.

During the current academic year (1993-94), the existing PDS Collaborative Inquiry committee merged with a newly established group under Project UNITE (Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education). This new configuration, which also brought additional human and monetary resources, resulted in a reworked definition/description of collaborative inquiry and a call for proposals for inquiry projects (See Appendix B). Appendix C depicts the type of activities that have occurred since January 1994 and provides a sample of our current instrument for screening inquiry proposals. Appendix D is a sample of one of five collaborative inquiry proposals funded as of March 1, 1994.

Although year one efforts (1992-93) to promote collaborative inquiry were disappointing, we later discovered that our experience was not unique. Calhoun and Glickman (1993) documented similar issues and dilemmas in their multi-site League of Professional Schools. Confounding variables emanate from both the university and the schools and seem closely connected to the previous discussion about cultural or workplace differences.

Clift, et al. (1993), Sagor (1992b), and Veal, et al., (1989) document the importance of variables such as leadership, work environment, collaborative work patterns and organizational culture, and norms of experimentation on reflection and inquiry. As previously asserted, although these variables are more descriptive of university settings than schools, nationally we lack enough faculty in both settings who have been enculturated/inculcated to expect and subsequently pursue or enact collaborative inquiry. Certainly examples are increasing, but they remain exceptions rather than norms.

In most, if not all instances of successful collaborative inquiry, participants would attest that the paradigm shift is a long-term, labor-intensive endeavor. As documented by Oja (1990) and Oja and Smulyan (1989), collaborative action research requires simultaneous attention to three major processes: 1) group dynamics/group process, 2) action resarch cycle/process, and 3) adult development theories. Not only do school and university faculty need awareness of these processes, they also need information about and concrete experiences with them. Elaboration of each is provided in the final sections of this paper.

The need for shared understandings and common experiences is linked inexorably to principles espoused by the Holmes Group (1990), Sagor (1992b), and Veal, et al. (1989), cited previously. To develop shared understandings and collegial relationships requires common experiences. Common experiences requires leadership that provides opportunities for professional discourse which can result in mutually developed collaborative inquiry projects. The nature, kind, and quality of professional discourse depends on development of individual and collective knowledge about and attention to interpersonal relationships. Establishing conditions necessary for a cross-cultural paradigm shift to support collaborative inquiry was challenging enough in a single site in Michigan (Rafferty, 1994). Accounting for and managing complexities across multiple and diverse sites in Indiana necessitated alternative strategies, as outlined in the following section.

Indiana State University - Next Steps

Our plan is to introduce and characterize collaborative inquiry as professional development. As described by Miller and Pine (1990) "action research is a staff development process which advances professional inquiry, improves education, and promotes teacher development" (p. 56). Working with IN2000 and PDS monies and committees, we plan to establish collaborative inquiry support/study groups at each of the 10 PDS sites. We hope that such an approach will emulate Fullan's "press for improvement" (1986) or the importance of simultaneous application of pressure and support to effect and sustain educational change.

An important precursor to this activity has been study group activity by the Collaborative Inquiry Team at ISU. During Fall 1993 we reviewed, read about, and discussed the basic qualities and critical issues of action research/collaborative inquiry before rewriting the existing definition and call for proposals. We also determined that an infrastructure to support collaborative inquiry projects would be necessary. Details of our proposal are contained in Appendix E, but a summary of our four goals and three phase plan follows:

Four Goals

1. Develop faculty at ISU/School Of Education who have knowledge and experience in conducting collaborative inquiry projects.

2. Develop a network of teachers at PDS sites who can assist SOE faculty in reviewing projects, offering support to colleagues, and conducting their own inquiry.

3. Systematically provide regular training in collaborative inquiry.

4. Establish essential resources to conduct qualitatively superior projects (e.g. outside consultants, workshops, materials, computer resources, etc.)

Three Phases

1. Preparation - Immerse Collaborative Inquiry Team members in the inquiry process via mini-projects and analyze efforts with experienced consultants.

2. Pilot Projects - Offer workshops Fall 1994 aimed at informing teachers of the purposes, processes, and skills of conducting action research; continue pilot inquiry projects; and plan for Spring 1995 Teacher Researcher Conference.

3. Establishing the Infrastructure - Develop an institutional program for teaching and supporting collaborative inquiry projects in SOE and at PDS sites for expanded/more sophisticated collaborative inquiry projects during 1995-96 and beyond.

Part of the educative process will be comparison between traditional inservice approaches and more progressive models such as classroom inquiry/collaborative inquiry. Both school and university faculty can benefit from such a paradigm shifting experience which acknowledges teachers' expertise and grounds research questions in their daily work with children. Concurrently, as noted previously, university faculty will (re)discover field-based questions and methodologies.

Another important component will be continued readings and discussions based on Oja and Smulyan's (1989) developmental approach to collaborative action research and Hubbard and Power's The Art of Classroom Research. We have yet to determine whether sequential or simultaneous attention is the best approach, but we certainly need to address the three processes previously mentioned:
1) group dynamics/group process, 2) action research cycle/process, and adult development theory. A brief rationale for each follows.

Group Dynamics/Group Process

Group dynamics research indicates that members work through sequential or cyclical phases of development to establish and maintain group norms, decision-making processes, communication patterns and roles, as well as interpersonal structures. How the group negotiates various aspects of interaction ultimately affects both goals and results (Oja and Smulyan, 1989, p. 55). Certainly, shared understandings about the importance of and complexities entailed in establishing rapport, trust, and communication will be an important foundation for our work together.

## Action Research Cycle/Process

Although many inquiry models exist, most contain elements outlined by Sagor (1992a): 1) problem formation, 2) data collection, 3) data analysis, 4) reporting of results, and 5) action planning (p. 10). Although there are "steps" in the process, it is important to note that they are likely to be recursive rather than sequential or linear. In addition, Oja and Smulyan (1989) also identify conditions necessary for collaborative action research, many of which are linked to group dynamics/group process.

> Successful collaborative action research depends on a project structure which allows the prior three characteristics (collaboration, focus on practice, and professional development) to emerge. A project structure conducive to effective action research consists of at least four elements: (i) frequent and open communication among participants, (ii) democratic project leadership, (iii) spiraling cycles of planning, acting, observing, reflecting, and (iv) positive relationships with the school context within which the project occurs (p. 16).

## Adult Development Theory

Oja and Smulyan (1989) devote nearly 50 pages to adult development which includes several different frameworks (paradigms) for ways individuals organize their worlds: 1) ego development, 2) moral/ethical judgment, 3) cognitive/conceptual development, and 4) interpersonal reasoning (pp. 99-100). As just one example of the importance of adult developmental stages on collaborative inquiry, Oja's research (1990) indicates that a gap in ego development at the Conscientious stage can hinder one's ability for empathy, mutuality, and valuing diverse perspectives. In university faculty this could mean inability to value teachers' practical knowledge while school faculty may be unwilling to understand perspectives of colleagues from various subject areas or grade levels (p. 10). Potential impacts on

group dynamics/group process and collaborative inquiry should be obvious, especially if we hope to establish organic collaboration of the type described by Whitford, et al. (1987).

These researchers distinguish between three types of collaboration - cooperative, symbiotic, and organic (p. 153). Collaboration that is merely cooperative is characterized by arrangements primarily based on personal contacts rather than institutional affiliations. The success of symbiotic collaboration rests on reciprocity and mutual self-interest while organic collaboration strives to identify issues that are jointly owned and resolved. Because the nature and intent of our professional development school initiative is to precipitate simultaneous renewal for the schools and the university, organic collaboration should best serve all of our needs. Therefore, it is necessary to incorporate adult development theory into our future plans to help establish collaborative relationships that will withstand inevitable challenges.

Summary and Conclusion

This paper has characterized collaborative inquiry as having much potential to support learning and restructuring at both schools and universities. This assertion, however, rests on recognition of the potential and often inevitable complexities in equipping faculty with skills, abilities, and dispositions necessary to collaborate in ways to ensure simultaneous renewal at their respective sites.

As a final note, it is also imperative that we find ways to depict collaborative inquiry, as well as the development of requisite characteristics to accomplish it, as a journey rather than a destination. Such a perspective could foster patience and enhance our

individual and collective ability to embrace the complexities and ambiquities we are likely to face. I look forward to reporting outcomes of the goals and phases outlined herein.

## References


Burkan, W. (1989). Paradigm summary notes. Lake Elmo, MN: Infinity Limited, Inc.

Calhoun, E.F. and Glickman, C.D. (1993). Issues and dilemmas of action research in the league of professional schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Clift, R., Veal, M.L., Johnson, M., and Holland, P. (1993). Restructuring teacher education through collaborative action research. Journal of Teacher Education, 41(2), 52-62.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Fullan, M. (1986). Improving on the implementation of educational school organization. Elementary School Journal, 6(3), 321-326.

Green, N., Baldini, B., and Stack, W.M. (1993). Spanning cultures: Teachers and professors in professional development schools. Action in Teacher Education, 15(2), 18-24.

Harste, J.C. (1993). Response to Ridgeway, Dunston, & Qian: Standards for instructional research. Reading Research Quarterly, 28(4), 356-358.

Henry, M., Williams, R., and Kelty, D. (1994). Professional development schools that put the pieces together: The Indiana State University and public school experience. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Atlanta, GA.

Holmes Group, (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hubbard, R.S. and Power, B.M. (1993). The art of classroom inquiry. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Miller, D.M. and Pine, G.J. (1990). Advancing professional inquiry for educational improvement through action research. Journal of Staff Development, 11(3), 56-61.

Oja, S.N. (1990). Developmental theories and the professional development of teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Oja, S.N. and Pine, G.J. (1987). Collaborative action research: Teachers' stages of development in school contexts. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 96-115.

Oja, S.N. and Smulyan, L. (1989). Collaborative action research: A developmental approach. London: The Falmer Press.

Rafferty, C.D. (1993a). Animal, vegetable, or mineral: What is a professional development school? Contemporary Education, 64(4), 223-225.

Rafferty, C.D. (1993b) Professional self-efficacy: Preparing teachers for professional development schools. Contemporary Education, 64(4), 226-229.

Rafferty, C.D. (1994). Promoting reflection and inquiry in a restructured school. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 30(2), 72-76.

Sagor, R.D. (1992a). How to conduct collaborative action research. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sagor, R.D. (1992b). Institutionalizing collaborative action research: The role of leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Schaefer, R.J. (1967). The schoool as a center of inquiry. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Sirotnick, K.A. and Goodlad, J.I. (Eds.) (1988). School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. New York: Teachers College Press.

Veal, M.L., Clift, R., and Holland, P. (1989). School contexts that encourage reflection: Teacher perceptions. Qualitative Studies in Education, 2(4), 315-333.

Watts, H. (1985). When teachers are researchers, teaching improves. Journal of Staff Development, 6(2), 118-127.

Whitford, B.L., Schlechty, P.C., and Shelor, L.G. (1987). Sustaining action research through collaboration: Inquiries for invention. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(3), 151-169.

---

The author would like to acknowledge and thank members of Indiana State University's Collaborative Inquiry Team: Lisa Bischoff, John Carter, Bob George, Fred Isele, Terry O'Connor, Anne Raymond, and Bill Smith. In addition, thanks also go to the following public school faculty who serve on the PDS Steering Committee and Collaborative Inquiry Proposal Screening Team: Susan Eisman, Dave Kelty, and Margaret Liebermann.

APPENDIX A

## DEFINING COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY

After subcommittee meetings, feedback from various Professional Development School sites, and reactions from the PDS Steering Committee, we offer the following definition/description of collaborative inquiry. This description is related to Characteristic 4 (A PDS supports inquiry, research, and exchange of professional knowledge) from the Professional Development School proposal submitted for ISU and Lilly funds. Please use this definition as a springboard for conversation about ways we can promote, establish, and support collaboration between ISU and public school faculty to improve teaching and learning for all!

COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY REPRESENTS A VARIETY OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES SELECTED TO ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS CONCERNING EDUCATION AT THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LEVEL. EXAMPLES OF THESE METHODOLOGIES WOULD BE SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS, ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK, AS WELL AS MORE TRADITIONAL QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES. ALL PDS STAKEHOLDERS, INCLUDING PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS, ISU STUDENTS AND FACULTY, CAN PARTICIPATE. IT MAY ADDRESS CONCERNS SUCH AS EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES, LEARNING STYLES, IMPLEMENTATION OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT, CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, EFFECTIVE READING TECHNIQUES, OR ANY OTHER INVESTIGATION RELEVANT TO TEACHING AND LEARNING.

COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY IS BOTH PRACTICAL AND RELEVANT TO TEACHING AND LEARNING AT ALL LEVELS. THIS FORM OF INQUIRY MUTUALLY BENEFITS OUR PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION BY ADDRESSING COMMON CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS RELATED TO ALL LEARNERS IN THIS PARTNERSHIP. IT SHOULD ENHANCE AND INFORM PDS SITES, IN2000 SCHOOLS (ALSO KNOWN AS DISCOVERY SCHOOLS), AND ISU'S RESTRUCTURING EFFORTS.

## CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY PROJECTS

As a way to promote and support collaborative inquiry the Professional Development School Steering Committee announces the availability of grant monies. Collaborative teams of school and university faculty are encouraged to apply for this support by submitting the following information. Maximum length: 6 pages.

1) Names, school addresses, phone numbers of collaborative inquiry team.

2) Description of the project focus/inquiry question with projected time-line, data gathering and analysis plan.

3) Explanation of relationship of inquiry to PDS vision and restructuring efforts.

4) Description of plan to disseminate findings to colleagues and ISU students. Upon project completion each team will submit a written and oral report to PDS Steering Committee including an accounting of grant monies.

5) Projected budget*



(*Maximum funding per project will be $400.00.)

APPENDIX B

Indiana State University

Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology

January 28, 1994

Dear PDS/ISU Faculty Member,

Attached please find a description of Collaborative Inquiry and Call for Proposals for Collaborative Inquiry projects. As part of our Professional Development School partnership we have $4000 available to support inquiry projects which investigate issues related to restructuring such as implementation of curricular, instructional, and/or assessment initiatives; effects of staff development opportunities; etc.

Please note that each project proposal requires participation of both school and university faculty. In addition, we encourage administrators, central office personnel, parents, business/community representatives, and others interested in seeking answers to educational questions to be involved in the process. As explained in the attachment, inquiry projects could range from one school and one university faculty member exploring the impact of math manipulatives on student learning to larger groups investigating the impact of school-wide initiatives such as "Community of Caring" or Service Learning.

There will be two proposal deadlines for Spring 1994 (March 1 and April 1), but the need for a second deadline is contingent upon remaining funds. Additional monies and proposal information will be announced Fall 1994.

If you have questions or desire more information, please contact one of the ISU faculty members listed below. We look forward to hearing from you soon and receiving proposals in the near future.

Sincerely,

Cathleen D. Rafferty

Cathleen D. Rafferty
Collaborative Inquiry Team

| | |
|---|---|
| Lisa Bischoff | 237-7785 |
| John Carter | 237-2932 |
| Bob George | 237-2934 |
| Fred Isele | 237-2846 |
| Terry O'Connor | 237-2935 |
| Cathleen Rafferty | 237-2958 |
| Anne Raymond | 237-2859 |
| Bill Smith | 237-2855 |

Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
(812) 237-2960

# COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY DESCRIPTION AND CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Professional Development Schools are contexts for systematic change and reflection about change. Stakeholders in these schools recognize that they understand best the needs of their unique educational communities. These public school and university educators draw upon their knowledge and understanding of parents, students, teaching and learning to identify concerns most important to them as they work together to improve their schools. As they enact restructuring initiatives, they look inward to assess their efforts. Their inquiry sometimes requires the expertise of professional researchers, but in most cases stakeholders simply ask what it is that they want to know and how they can answer their own questions. Just as they draw upon the strengths of others in the school community to identify and solve problems, they look to each other to determine the success of their initiatives, however large or small. One teacher may want to know if a strategy tried with a small group of students is succeeding. Other educators may want to know if a schoolwide effort has resulted in meaningful change. These educational stakeholders are inquiring about the success of their work and that inquiry is often the effort of more than one person. Such collaborative inquiry is at the heart of PDS/IN2000 restructuring.

Collaborative Inquiry creates teams of educators who examine issues of practical concern. This approach to educational research aims to bridge the gap between traditional research and classroom practice. Choosing from appropriate research methods, school/university teams explore questions that range from student motivation to teaching strategies to school leadership. Results can usually be immediately translated into educational responses to persistent daily concerns.

School/university inquiry teams may receive modest funding by submitting requests to the PDS Steering Committee, Attention: Cathleen D. Rafferty, School of Education 1023, Indiana State University (237-2958). Proposals of no more than 3-5 pages should include:

1) Brief statement that relates the project to the school's PDS/ IN2000 vision.

2) Description of the research plan, including a discussion of methods, timelines, and budget* (e.g. materials, substitutes for reallocated time, stipends, etc.).

3) Methods to disseminate findings to school/university colleagues.

4) Names and contact information for both school and university faculty involved in the project.

*Approved grants will typically receive $400.00. Proposals will be reviewed on an on-going, first-come-first-served basis. Deadlines for Spring 1994 consideration will be March 1 and April 1.

To: Collaborative Inquiry Committee
From: Cathleen D. Rafferty
Date: February 25, 1994
Re: Today's Meeting

Our UNITE Action Plan (a copy was put in your mailbox earlier this week for comments) was approved yesterday by UNITE steering committee. Please note the following clarifications on page 3:

Collaborative Inquiry committee members who work on approved projects (i.e. those who receive up to $400 from the PDS grant) will receive $200.00 stipend from UNITE to fulfill requirements delineated on top page 3 of our UNITE action plan. The $200.00 must be used for a common purpose (e.g. travel or materials, not both). In other words, with accounts this small it is impossible to use $25 for books, $50 for mileage, etc.

We have received collaborative inquiry proposals from faculty not currently on our committee. After proposals are screened and decisions made, I will write a memo inviting other ISU faculty to become eligible for the $200.00 stipend. The memo will inform them of the duties as outlined on top of page 3 of Action Plan and that we use Hubbard and Power as our "operating manual." Those who wish to receive $200.00 will then join our group.

We also looked at the attached "Screening Criteria" which will be piloted on Monday, February 28 when Lisa, Bill and I plus three public school representatives meet to screen proposals. After this trial run we will refine the instrument as needed and discuss need for more definitive criteria under circumstances when # of proposals exceeds our budget.

For next time please work on the following items:

1) Identify potential workshop facilitators for Spring 1994 and perhaps think of folks who could serve as Adams Visiting Scholars.

2) Read Chapters 1 and 2 in Hubbard and Powers. For those actually engaged in Collaborative Inquiry projects, be prepared to link the text to your work in progress. THANKS!!!!!!

NEXT MEETING, MONDAY, MARCH 14, ROOM 914, 1:00 - 2:30

DRAFT

# SCREENING CRITERIA

## COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY PROPOSALS - SPRING 1994

Proposal #_____ Recommendation_____

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure 1) Proposal explains connection of project to the school's PDS and/or IN2000 vision.

2) Proposal provides the following information:

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure a) Research Plan/Methods or Procedures

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure b) Timeline

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure c) Budget

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure 3) Proposal indicates ways to disseminate findings to school/university colleagues.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure 4) Proposal provides names/contact information for both school and university faculty.

Amount Requested_____

Amount Recommended_____

Additional Comments or Feedback:

APPENDIX D

# COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY PROPOSAL
# SPRING 1994

## Purpose and Connection to Chauncey Rose's PDS/IN2000 Mission and Vision

The purpose of this collaborative inquiry project is to explore, pilot, and assess implementation of portfolios in various classrooms at grades six, seven, and eight at Chauncey Rose Middle School. More specifically our inquiry question will be: "In our exploration of portfolio assessment, what effective ways to learn about and implement portfolios can we identify that will be helpful to our colleagues and Chauncey Rose students?"

Chauncey Rose Middle School's IN2000 vision is a "student-centered approach which fosters individuality, self-worth, connectedness, social responsibility, and desire for life-long learning." This project is innately connected to our vision primarily because use of portfolios stimulates thinking and promotes independence and self assessment thereby building a stronger commitment to life-long learning.

In addition, it is important that we understand more about portfolios and other alternative assessments because through PL19-1992 the state of Indiana has mandated a new assessment program which includes portfolios as one component of a five-part system. As a Professional Development School, we accept our responsibility to provide "cutting-edge" instruction because we are also partners in the professional preparation of future teachers. As such, we need to be exemplary role models.

## Description of the Research Project

Our Spring 1994 plan contains several components: 1) Readings and Discussions, 2) Site Visitations, 3) Planning and Piloting, 4) Documentation and Evaluation, and 5) Budget.

### 1) Readings and Discussions

We plan to acquaint ourselves with the professional literature on portfolio assessment, particularly as it pertains to middle grades education. Primary resources will be the Middle School Journal and Educational Leadership which have recently published thematic issues on the subject of alternative or performance assessment. Our initial plan includes study group meetings every two weeks to discuss readings and identify pertinent information for our future work. Our readings will also help us formulate questions for site visitations.

2) Site Visitations

In late March we will schedule site visitations to exemplary Indiana middle schools which have employed portfolios for several years. These schools will be identified through contacts and resources such as the Middle Grades Improvement Network and Indiana Middle Level Education Association. Primary purposes for these visitations is to see portfolios constructed by middle grades students and to talk to teachers and students about the process of understanding and using portfolios in middle grades classrooms.

3) Planning and Piloting

Once we have a comfortable level of understanding, we will devise our own implementation plan to pilot portfolios in several sixth, seventh, and eighth grade classrooms. Because this is a pilot project, it is likely that each teacher involved may pilot portfolios in only one class period. This will enable us to more closely monitor the impact and gather appropriate documentation data.

4) Documentation and Evaluation

It will also be necessary for us to become acquainted with various action research or collaborative inquiry techniques. Because many of these techniques are congruent with skills teachers need to use portfolios (e.g. anecdotal records, journals or logs, observation notes, maintaining collections of student work, etc.), we will merge readings on these topics throughout the pilot project. We also understand that ISU is planning various workshops or other professional development activities to assist us with documentation and evaluation.

5) Budget

Our total budget request is for $400.00. The following itemized list contains projections. Actual expenses will be documented and reported at completion of this phase of the project.

| | |
|---|---|
| $50.00 | Duplication |
| $50.00 | Transcription Fees for Audiotaped Discussions |
| $100.00 | Materials/Supplies (Reflective Journals, Notebooks, Books, Audiotapes, etc. to pilot portfolios) |
| $200.00 | Site Visitations (Meals, Travel, etc.) |
| $400.00 | TOTAL |

Dissemination Plan

An integral part of our project is to identify effective ways to learn about and subsequently implement portfolios, i.e. a "trainer of trainers" type of model. Ways to share our findings could include: 1) team meetings, 2) faculty meetings, 3) staff development sessions, 4) newsletters or articles (e.g. The Collaborator or Contemporary Education), 5) presentations to the PDS Steering Committee,

6) presentations at local, state, or national conferences, 7) presentations to ISU teacher preparation classes, 8) participation in the First Annual Teacher Researcher or Collaborative Inquiry Conference, May 1995, etc.

Project Participants - Contact Information

Chauncey Rose Middle School - 462-4474

| Sixth Grade Team | Seventh Grade Team | Eighth Grade Team |
|---|---|---|
| Shelly Macdonald | Sherri Herner | Julia Foltz |
| Mike Sipes | Amy Hodge | Marilyn Leinenbach |
| Tracey Laubert | Ann Johnson | (Tammy Roeschlein) |

Indiana State University - 237-2958

Cathleen D. Rafferty

APPENDIX E

COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY TEAM

UNITE ACTION PLAN

Summary of Activities

The Fall semester was spent reviewing the general area of action research. We shared articles and discussed the basic qualities and the critical issues of action research. As the semester concluded, we had developed familiarity with the core ideas of collaborative action research projects. We used this background to re-write the PDS Call for Proposals. We decided that it is necessary to develop an infrastructure which can support collaborative inquiry projects between university and school faculty.

Program Needs

Collaborative inquiry is one of the keystones of successful Professional Development School sites. The attitude of open inquiry is basic to educators who will continue to search for better approaches to schooling. Expertise in systematic approaches to the study of relevant issues is fundamental to gaining the rewards of open inquiry. Unfortunately, neither the attitude nor the skills of classroom research are common among American educators.

This project aims to provide an infrastructure that encourages and supports educators who are willing to become thoughtful practioners. To achieve this vision, we developed the following goals:

*We should develop faculty at the School of Education who are familiar with current scholarship on Collaborative Inquiry, experienced in conducting collaborative projects, and capable of conducting training and offering on-going support to new practioners.

*We should develop a network of teachers capable of conducting classroom-based research who can complement SOE faculty by assisting in reviewing appropriate projects, offering support to other classroom researchers, and conducting models of good collaborative studies.

*We should organize a systematic program that provides regular training in collaborative research.

*We should establish a collection of essential resources to support efforts to conduct qualitatively superior projects, including outside consultants, workshops, materials, and computer resources.

Proposed Plan

The project will build the essential infrastructure through a series of phases.

PHASE I -- PREPARATION

In order to develop the necessary expertise in collaborative inquiry projects, the Spring 1994 semester will be used to immerse project participants in the collaborative inquiry process and to analyze these efforts with experienced consultants.

The project will assist participants in designing and implementing pilot collaborative inquiry projects. The Hubbard and Power book, The Art of Classroom Inquiry will serve as a common blueprint for projects. After initial stages of research have been completed, the project will hold a 1/2 day workshop in which outside consultants meet with collaborative inquiry teams to review initial efforts and offer advice. A second 1/2 day workshop will be conducted at the end of the semester, allowing the outside consultant to help participants review project activities.

PHASE II -- PILOT PROJECTS

The experience gained in the Spring semester will be used to organize a year-long pilot project in which teams from PDS sites will be invited to conduct year-long collaborative inquiry projects. The Fall 1994 semester will offer initial workshops aimed at informing teachers of the purposes, processes, and skills of conducting action research. The Spring 1995 semester will conclude with a conference in which results from each project will be reported to the group. Throughout the year, project participants will be in contact with an outside expert contracted through the Adams Fellowship fund. Schools will be encouraged to consider projects supportive of IN2000 and Professional Development School goals and evaluation needs.

PHASE III -- ESTABLISHING THE INFRASTRUCTURE

Based on the experiences gained during the pilot phase, we anticipate the development of an institutional program for teaching and supporting collaborative inquiry projects in the School of Education and at PDS sites. Our aim is to discover from the pilot projects the most appropriate organization of inservice meetings, workshops, courses, and other support for collaborative inquiry projects. These instructional units will be used to create a second round of collaborative inquiry projects in the 1995-96 academic year. The Adams Fellowship fund might continue involvement by an expert outside consultant to assist us in constructing a solid program in collaborative inquiry.